

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This paper is filed in response to the Final Rejection dated October 29, 2007. Claims 1-18 are currently pending. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 4-9 and 13-18 are directed to allowable subject matter. Claims 4 and 13 have been amended in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, per the Examiner's suggestion. Claims 5-9 depend from claim 4, and claims 14-18 depend from claim 13. No new matter is added.

Claim 19 has been withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Applicant retains the right to present claim 19 in a divisional application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 10-12 as obvious in light of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,926,812 ("Hilsenrath") and the publication entitled "Automatic thyroid diagnostics via simulation of physician judgment" ("Johannes"). Applicant does not wish to amend the rejected claims, and Applicant does not concede that the combined prior art references renders the rejected claims as obvious. Rather, the arguments below are presented to overcome the rejection.

### **A. Rejection for Obviousness**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3 and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Hilsenrath in view of Johannes. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims would not have been obvious in light of these prior art references.

#### **1. Claims 1-3 and 10-12 Would Not Have Been Obvious In View of the Combination of Hilsenrath and Johannes.**

Claim 1 requires the steps of "receiving a segmented judgment matrix, the segmented judgment matrix being a numerical matrix pairing each of a set of terms to each of a set of classifications, each term being a word or phrase, the segmented judgment matrix having a plurality of information submatrices, each element of each information submatrix representing a rating of a relevance of the term of the element to the classification of the element, each information submatrix being a numerical matrix representing the relevance of each of a subset of the set of terms to each of a subset of the set classifications; and using the segmented judgment matrix to calculate an information spectrum." Claim 10 claims a computer program product for

performing the steps of claim 1. The Examiner candidly admits that “Hilsenrath does not particularly indicate that the matrix used is a judgment matrix.” Thus, neither of these steps is disclosed in Hilsenrath.

The Examiner attempts to cure this deficiency in Hilsenrath by citing Johannes. According to the Examiner, because Johannes discloses a judgment matrix in correlated documents, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify the system disclosed in Hilsenrath to allow users of Hilsenrath's system to retrieve relevant documents based on their level of correlation with a requested document. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, Hilsenrath teaches a document extraction and comparison method for comparing the contents of two sets of documents by generating word clusters. Each word cluster comprises a cluster word list having N words, an NxN total distance matrix, and an NxN number of connections matrix. The Examiner states that any two clusters may be combined by taking the union of their cluster word lists and merging their matrices. However, a key characteristic of the Hilsenrath merged matrices is that they are comprised of cluster word lists that are created based upon the proximity of words to other words. As the Examiner acknowledges, Hilsenrath calls a procedure that returns a list of words within a predetermined distance from a given word in the document. This is not the segmented judgment matrix of claim 1, which, as claimed, is a “numerical matrix.” Claim 1 discloses a segmented judgment matrix having a plurality of information submatrices, each element of each information submatrix representing a rating of a relevance of the term of the element to the classification of the element, each information submatrix being a numerical matrix representing the relevance of each of a subset of the set of terms to each of a subset of the set classification. Therefore, the numerical matrix limitation found in claim 1 is not found in Hilsenrath.

Applicant also notes, and the Examiner agrees that Hilsenrath lacks the use of a judgment matrix. Neither does Johannes. Johannes teaches use of a matrix in correlated documents; however, this is not the judgment matrix as claimed by Applicant in claims 1 and 10. The matrix taught by Johannes is unsegmented and lacks the information submatrices found in claims 1 and 10.

In Applicant's amendment filed on July 31, 2007, Applicant detailed how the combination of the teachings of cited references fails to disclose the claimed invention. Applicant incorporates those arguments in full, and reiterates that Johannes' teachings contravene what is claimed in claims 1 and 10. As such, even if one were to combine the matrices of

Johannes with the extraction and comparison method of Hilsenrath, the combination would not disclose claims 1-3 and 10-12.


Claim 10 claims a computer product that performs the method of claim 1. Therefore, the above reasoning that supports a finding a nonobviousness applies equally to claim 10. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1. Claims 11-12 depend from claim 10. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

**B. Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 10, as well as claims 2-3 and 11-12 which depend from claims 1 and 10 respectively, are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 10-12 be withdrawn, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Dated: February 14, 2008

By:   
Michael E. Dergosits  
Registration No. 31,243

Please direct correspondence to:

Michael Dergosits  
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1450  
San Francisco, California 94111  
(415) 705-6377 Telephone  
(415) 705-6383 Facsimile